

**Office of Economic Development  
Economic Development Advisory Board  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Date:** May 4, 2010: **Time:** 7:30 A.M.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Rich Adams  
Christian Alder  
Terry Benelli  
Jared Langkilde  
Jim LeCheminant  
Steve Parker  
Jeff Pitcher  
Jo Wilson  
Steve Wood

**EX-OFFICIO**

Mayor Scott Smith (excused)  
Chris Brady  
Brian Campbell  
Jeff Crockett  
Charlie Deaton  
Steve Shope

**STAFF PRESENT**

Betsy Adams  
William Jabjiniak  
Mike James  
Shea Joachim  
Patrick Murphy  
Gordon Sheffield  
Jodi Sorrell

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

None

**GUESTS**

Marc Soronson  
Wulf Grote

**1. Chair's Call To Order**

Chair Jim LeCheminant called the May 4, 2010 meeting of the Economic Development Advisory Board to order at 7:31 A.M. at the City of Mesa Council Chambers, Lower Level, 57 E. 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Mesa, AZ 85201.

**2. Items from Citizens Present**

None

**3. Approval of Minutes from April 6, 2010 board meeting.**

Chair LeCheminant called for a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held on April 6, 2010.

**MOTION:** Terry Benelli moved that the minutes from April 6, 2010 be approved as written.

**SECOND:** Christian Alder

**DECISION:** Passed unanimously.

**4. Appointment of Special Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) Committee members**

Chair LeCheminant appointed board members Jeff Crockett, Steve Parker, Rich Adams, Brian Campbell and Jim LeCheminant and community partner Roc Arnett to the Special Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) Subcommittee. This special subcommittee will provide guidance in the preparation of a Redevelopment Plan for the Air Force Research Lab (AFRL).

Mr. William Jabjiniak explained that the AFRL located at the Gateway Airport is part of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process with the lab being scheduled to move to Ohio. City Council has approved the establishment of a LRA. Mr. Patrick Murphy is taking the lead on the LRA and with the existing workload will need help from the committee to craft and develop a Redevelopment Plan for the area. The objective is to keep as many of those jobs here and be able to grow the number of jobs. It sits on a little over 7 acres with 9 or 10 buildings on the site. He also commented that in the next several weeks that official recognition will be given from the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) for the establishment of the LRA. He requested Patrick to update the Board on the next steps being appointed the LRA.

Patrick Murphy explained what it means to be the LRA. The LRA is the lead agency in working with the OEA and the Air Force in the BRAC reuse process. The LRA leads in crafting a Redevelopment Plan for the site. As part of the development of the plan there will be public outreach meetings. An advertisement will be sent out by the OEA to the public, or any party interested in the reuse of the property, establishing the City of Mesa as the official LRA. The LRA will take an active part in seeking interest in the surplus property of the AFRL for reuse, craft a Redevelopment Plan and then make a recommendation to the Air Force for the best reuse of the property.

**5. Presentation on Light Rail Recommendations**

Mr. Shea Joachim explained the City Councils' Strategic Initiatives are: Economic Development; Community Engagement; Quality of Life; Regional Leadership and Financial Stability. The City Council is also focused on Mesa's Downtown and the Light Rail Extension.

Mr. Wulf Grote, Director of Project Development at Metro, explained that the High Capacity Transit Alternatives Analysis was a 2 year process starting in 2007 and was adopted by the City Council in May 2009. The purpose of the analysis was to identify the alignment and technology. The Project Team evaluated the rider benefits, cost, traffic, design and constructability. The Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) extension route is from Sycamore through the downtown on Main Street to Mesa Drive. The total time frame for the Light Rail Extension Project from start to finish is approximately 10 years (2007-2016). It begins with Community Outreach (2007-2016), Alternatives Analysis (2007-2009), Design Elements (2010-2011), Environmental Assessment (2009-2010), Design (2010-mid 2011), Pre-construction (mid 2011-2013), Construction (2013-2015), and ending with the Pre-operation/Start-up (early 2016).

The Community Design Elements involved: Traffic lane configuration in downtown Mesa; On-Street parking; Bicycle facilities; Street lighting and OCS; Left turn

requirements; Pedestrian access points; Station Design; Urban design/public art; and Construction staging. Recommended Station Locations are: east of Country Club, east of Center Street and east of Mesa Drive.

The locations of the 4 additional Traction Power Substations have not been determined. The Substations supply power to the vehicles and systems and must be placed at one-mile intervals near the tracks. Typical dimensions are 20 feet x 40 feet x 12 feet high. These site locations will be recommended during the designing.

The projected ridership on an average weekday is estimated at 4,750 riders. The Preliminary Cost Estimate is \$198 million with 40% of the cost coming from the Regional Proposition 400 funds and 60% coming from federal funding.

The current activities are: Federal environmental documentation will be finalized in Summer to Fall of 2010; Initiate Small Starts Project development with FTA approval anticipated by the end of Spring 2010; Central Mesa Light Rail Stakeholders Committee continues to work with stakeholders to define the criteria for downtown urban design elements; and on-going public outreach.

The City Council will be asked to approve the station locations and traffic configurations for the central Mesa light rail transit extension and financial commitment for the operation of the extension.

Chair LeCheminant inquired of the estimated total operational cost.

Mr. Wulf Grote explained the City of Mesa will have an annual operational cost of approximately \$3 million, as the system does not pay for itself. The fare box pays only 25% of the total cost of operation.

Mr. Marc Soronson commented that the recommended route of the Light Rail will continue to move traffic smoothly through the downtown area with alternate routes using 1<sup>st</sup> Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Broadway or University to bypass Main Street.

Chair LeCheminant encouraged the Board to support the recommendations presented for the Light Rail and to encourage the City Council to approve the station locations, traffic configurations and financial commitment for the operation of the extension.

**MOTION:** Steve Wood moved to encourage the City Council to support the recommendations presented for the Light Rail and to approve the station locations, traffic configurations and financial commitment for the operation of the extension.

**SECOND:** Rich Adams

**DECISION:** Passed unanimously

## **6. Additional nominations and election of new Chair and Vice-Chair, effective July 1, 2010**

Chair LeCheminant commented that the July meeting will have a new Chairman and Vice-chairman. He suggested a recommendation for the current Vice-chairman, Jeff Crockett, to become the Chair and Rich Adams as the Vice-chairman for the EDAB Board. Any other additional nominations as we are open for suggestions.

Chair LeCheminant called for a motion to elect the nominated officers, which are Jeff Crockett as Chair and Rich Adams as Vice-Chair for 2010/2011.

**MOTION:** Christian Alder moved to elect Jeff Crockett as the new Chair and Rich Adams as the Vice-Chair for 2010/2011.

**SECOND:** Jeff Pitcher

**DECISION:** Passed unanimously

Mr. Jabjiniak thanked the newly elected officers for taking on the responsibility and reiterated the elected officers will resume their duties as of July 1, 2010. He thanked Jim LeCheminant for his service and support serving as the Chair the last year and a half.

## **7. Update on Zoning Ordinance Modules**

Mr. Gordon Sheffield stated the goals of the Zoning Ordinance Update is to: Make Zoning easier to use; Streamline development approval; Address Infill Development; Achieve a high level of design quality; Promote housing variety and choice; Support economic growth; Enhance environmental quality; and Increase administrative flexibility.

The Introductory Provisions include:

- Overview of Zoning Ordinance Structure
- Rules for Language Construction (and/or, shall/may)
- Rules for Measurement and Interpretation
- Establishment of Districts and Boundaries
- Designation of Zoning Map

The organization of Title 11 of the draft Zoning Ordinance Update is intended to provide a logical structure to the revised ordinance in making it easier to use and amend over time. The most frequently consulted sections appear towards the front and the less frequently used sections have been moved to the back.

**Article 1: Introductory Provisions** which establishes the overall purpose of the zoning code text, map and general rules that govern their applicability and use.

**Article 2 and 3: Base and Overlay Zone Regulations** specify the land use, development and design standards for each.

A number of significant changes and new elements are in the draft Zoning Ordinance Update. New zoning districts have been created to address General Plan policy, including 5 base zones:

- RSL (Residential Small Lot, with 4 variations)
- MX (Mixed Use)
- TMX (Transit Mixed Use, with 2 variations)
- HI (Heavy Industrial)
- ID (Infill Development, with 2 variations)

New Zone Abbreviations have been added:

- Agricultural: AG
- Residential: RS, RSL, RM

- Commercial: NC,LC,GC,OC, MX
- Employment: LI,GI,HI,PEP
- Downtown: DR 1-3, DB 1-2, DC
- Transit-oriented: TMX 1 and 2
- Public and Semi-Public: PS
- Planned Community: PC

**Article 4: Regulations Applying in Some or all Zones** include those standards that apply generally to all zones. Standards applicable to particular zones will appear within the development and supplemental regulations of that zone chapter. Chapters proposed for this division include the following: General Site Regulations; Standards for Specific Uses and Activities; Antennas and Wireless Communications Facilities; Landscaping; On-site Parking and Loading; Performance Standards; and Nonconforming Uses, Structures, and Lots.

**Articles 5 and 6: Sign Regulations and Form-based Development Regulations** have been reserved to allow for insertion of the existing sign ordinance, which was not a part of this Update project, and in anticipation of the development of form-based regulations.

**Article 7: Administration and Permits** section expands upon and refines many of the administrative sections in the current zoning ordinance for responsibilities; establishes procedures for all types of approval; specific processes and permits; and clarifies the complementary roles of the Planning and Zoning Board, Planning Hearing Officer, Board of Adjustment, Zoning Administrator (and Zoning Hearing Officer), Design Review Board and Historic Preservation. Listed are the responsibilities, authority, and exact types of findings that each person or body is required to make when deciding on an application.

**Article 8: General Terms** serves as a reference section for previous articles. This article contains 2 main parts: use clarifications and definitions.

A few major revisions to Land Use Development policies are:

- The Mixing of Uses proposes options for additional land use classifications being added to several districts.
- Increased density for Multiple Residence Districts increases the number of dwellings per acre.
- Prescriptive Standards language has been rewritten from “should” to “shall”
- Infill Development Districts for designated sites may be developed under an Infill Plan that is designed to fit the project into the context of the neighborhood.
- Allowances for Front and Rear Yard Additions in Single Residence (RS) Districts to permit the livable area of a residence to encroach 10 feet in the front, and up to 10 feet in the rear for one-half the width of the dwelling.
- Uses of Initials as Abbreviations are proposed to reflect the name or principal land use characteristic of the zoning district.
- Multiple Development “Character” Standards have largely followed one set of standards or “one-size fits all”. Provisions have been made to allow for a general set of 3 different development conditions: Urban (more pedestrian oriented), Auto (more suburban oriented) and the Default Standard (undesignated, a combination of the 2).

- Allowances for a More “Urban” Approach to Development have been made for higher buildings, higher density maximums, smaller building setbacks, or even “build-to” lines that bring a building forward towards the street.

In short, this proposed Update to the Mesa Zoning Ordinance modernizes the approach used for regulating land development. It builds upon the successes of the existing zoning code, and incorporates ideas to encourage infill development and greyfield redevelopment, in addition to the more greenfield approaches of building projects. It recognizes the maturing nature of Mesa, and that the City’s growth outward from its downtown is limited. Options are needed to allow for future upward growth. It provides alternatives for encouraging the efficient use of land, for rewarding good design and infill site projects, and for development near transit lines.

Mr. Jabjiniak commended Mr. Sheffield for the outstanding and tremendous amount of work, in addition to the time that went into updating the Zoning Ordinance.

## **8. Directors Report**

The City of Mesa co-hosted a reception, in partnership with Phoenix/Mesa Gateway Airport and GPEC, at the Maintenance, Repair and Overhaul (MRO) Conference held on April 20-22, 2010 in Phoenix.

The Executive Subcommittee met on April 20, 2010 and discussed recommendations for the election of new officers to be conducted at the May EDAB meeting. They also discussed the need to move forward with the New Market Tax Credit application and appointing Board members to the Special LRA Committee.

The Workforce Subcommittee met on Tuesday, April 13, 2010. Chair Jo Wilson explained the Workforce Subcommittee is struggling to identify tasks or goals. She also commented that Dr. Keith Hjelmstad was a guest speaker. He explained the changes and programs at ASU Polytech. His presentation was very informative and impressive. The Subcommittee will be meeting sometime in June or July.

Mrs. Jo Wilson commented on the CLIP Grant. The draft of the application for the CLIP Grant was submitted on May 1<sup>st</sup>. After a review of the draft application suggestions were made for fine tuning the application for final submittal on June 1<sup>st</sup>. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation will review the request with an answer to be received by the end of July. If the grant is awarded, a sum of \$3 million will be given to Mesa over a period of 3 years.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated the CDBG Budget was approved by the City Council. In the approved CDBG budget, funding was requested to hire a staff person to focus on the Downtown area. The Economic Development office will proceed with hiring a staff person.

Jaye O’Donnell is attending the Bio 2010 International Convention in Chicago May 3- 6, 2010. This is the first time our office has attended a convention of this type.

A most welcome announcement by Boeing was made April 28, 2010 regarding their decision to manufacture the Unmanned Aviation Vehicle (UAV) in Mesa. UAV's are also known as Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA) or Remotely Piloted Vehicles (RPV).

Mr. Jabjiniak thanked everyone involved with the Franklin Pearce College Alumni Book Drive to benefit Mesa's Longfellow Elementary School. A special thank-you goes to Steve Wood for delivering approximately 700 books donated by Superstition Springs Mall/Westcor. We are only 531 books short, but still have books coming in and feel certain the goal of 2,700 books will be met.

#### **9. GPEC Update**

Mr. Brian Campbell updated the Board on the economic mission to Washington, D.C. on April 12-15, 2010. A delegation of approximately 60 people included Governor Jan Brewer, Attorney General Terry Goddard and business, political and community leaders from Arizona. The delegation was lead by the Greater Phoenix Economic Council (GPEC). The purpose of the mission was to represent Arizona and its economic interests. As a group, they pressed upon federal officials and Arizona's congressional delegation the need to support our state and region in a variety of economic endeavors. Specifically focused on were issues critical to Arizona's growth and prosperity such as aerospace and defense, banking, business development and renewable energy. Meetings with several members of the national media were also held to counter the prevalence of negative Arizona stories by conveying positive news about the region and state.

Other meetings also included the Federal Reserve, Federal Deposit of Insurance Corporation, the Congressional Oversight Panel for Troubled Asset Relief Program and the Small Business Administration. Numerous ways were discussed to increase Arizona's capital base, the impact of regulatory reform, and the need to get capital to small businesses that are the economic engine of Arizona.

Mayor Smith was the Vice-Chair of the Aerospace and Aviation Committee. He gave a stirring message on the need for a strong regional cooperation. His vision, guidance and leadership were commendable.

#### **10. Other Business**

Chair LeCheminant reminded the EDAB members of the next scheduled meeting on June 1, 2010 to be held at the City of Mesa Council Chambers, Lower Level, 57 E. 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Mesa, Arizona 85201.

**11. Adjournment**

Chair LeCheminant adjourned the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

Submitted By:

---

William J. Jabjiniak  
Economic Development Department Director  
(Prepared by Betsy Adams)